REMARKS

Claims 1-13 are pending in the present application. Claim 1 has been amended in this Response. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 is rejected for being indefinite because the recitation of "the system" is not clearly defined. Claim 1 has been amended to recite "the non-stored program content in the program content managing/providing system" for clarification. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that this rejection should be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102 / § 103

Claims 1-2, 5-7 and 10-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by Ellis et al. (US 20040117831, hereinafter "Ellis").

Claims 3-4 and 8-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ellis in view of O'Callaghan et al. (US 5594492, hereinafter "O'Callaghan").

These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 1 as amended recites, *inter alia,* "the program content analyzing/retrieving system receives and analyzes a broadcasted program content, extracts the program information to be stored independently from the broadcasted program content on a program content basis, and provides independently from the broadcasted program content the stored program information on a program content which meets a search condition for the user terminal in response to a search request of program information on a desired program content sent from the user terminal."

Ellis fails to disclose or suggest at least the above-noted claimed feature. In contrast, Ellis describes a system for providing interactive television program guide features and other features

and information related to a specific user interest or programming category in niche hubs. The television program guide data is transmitted from a main facility 12 to television distribution facility 16, in which the program guide data is processed and redistributed to user terminals. A program guide application can be set up on the client side or the server side. See Abstract and paragraphs 0089 and 0101 in Ellis.

In other words, the program guide data in Ellis's system is merely a prearranged data that is distributed to a user via a television distribution facility. As clearly discussed in the previous response, contrary to the assertion by the Examiner, the program guide data is neither a broadcasted program content nor a program information extracted from a broadcasted program content as in the present invention. In the Office Action, the Examiner admits that such erroneous interpretation of the claim features does not conform to the specification. However, the Examiner asserts that the interpretation is nonetheless reasonably broad. While Applicants disagree with the Examiner's assertion, claim 1 is amended to further clarify that the extracted program information is stored and provided to a user independently from broadcasted program content. Ellis does not disclose or suggest such features.

Thus, Ellis fails to disclose or suggest "the program content analyzing/retrieving system receives and analyzes a broadcasted program content, extracts the program information to be stored independently from the broadcasted program content on a program content basis, and provides independently from the broadcasted program content the stored program information on a program content which meets a search condition for the user terminal in response to a search request of program information on a desired program content sent from the user terminal" as recited in claim 1.

In view of the above remarks, it is respectfully submitted that Ellis does not anticipate independent claim 1. O'Callaghan does not remedy at least the above noted deficiencies of Ellis As claims 2-13 are dependent to claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that these claims are also patentable for at least their dependency. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that these rejections should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Dennis P. Chen Reg. No. 61,767 at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37.C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: March 23, 2009   Respectfully submitted,

                                         By

                                         D. Richard Anderson
                                         Registration No.: 40,439
                                         BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
                                         8110 Gatehouse Road
                                         Suite 100 East
                                         P.O. Box 747
                                         Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747
                                         (703) 205-8000
                                         Attorney for Applicant

DPC
DRA/DPC/lab